

Does a modification of special relativity imply energy dependent photon time delays?

J.M. Carmona, J.L. Cortés, and J.J. Relancio*

Departamento de Física Teórica, Universidad de Zaragoza, Zaragoza 50009, Spain

Theoretical arguments in favor of energy dependent photon time delays from a modification of special relativity (SR) have met with recent gamma ray observations that put severe constraints on the scale of such deviations. We review the case of the generality of this theoretical prediction and find that, at least in the simple model based on the analysis of photon worldlines which is commonly considered, there are many scenarios which do not contain a photon time delay. This will be the situation for any modified dispersion relation which reduces to $E = |\vec{p}|$ for photons, independently of the quantum structure of spacetime, or whether SR is deformed or violated (that is, with or without the presence of a relativity principle). This fact opens up the possibility of a phenomenologically consistent generalization of SR with a new mass scale many orders of magnitude below the Planck mass.

I. INTRODUCTION

Special relativity (SR) postulates Lorentz invariance as an exact symmetry of Nature. It is at the base of our quantum field theories of the fundamental interactions, and has surpassed all experimental tests up to date ([1]; see also the papers in [2]). A quantum gravity theory, however, is expected quite generally to break or modify this symmetry. A heuristic reasoning is that Lorentz invariance is a symmetry of spacetime, and the classical picture of a continuum spacetime must break down somehow at the Planck scale, where quantum effects of gravity (in the form of creation and evaporation of virtual black holes, for example [3]) should take place. Many approaches to quantum gravity incorporate a departure of Lorentz invariance in a form or another (for a review, see Ref. [4]), and the experimental confirmation or refutation of this hypothesis would be of great importance to constrain possible theoretical frameworks for a quantum theory of gravity.

Most of the signatures of a violation or deformation of Lorentz symmetry, however, are tiny, since they are supposed to be controlled by the Planck length, or, in terms relevant for particle processes, by a very high energy scale (the Planck mass, $m_P \approx 1.2 \times 10^{19} \text{ eV}/c^2$). Although one could then think that there are no ways to observe these effects, it has recently been realized that there are mechanisms that could amplify such deviations of SR. For example, a (small) energy dependence of the speed of photons could produce an observable time delay in the arrival of two photons of different energies emitted simultaneously. This observation has attracted interest since in the last years measurements of gamma ray bursts by the Fermi or the MAGIC telescopes have reached enough precision to put strong bounds on first order corrections in the photon energy over the Planck mass [5].

In the existent literature the result of an energy dependent photon time delay has been presented as an (almost) inescapable consequence of a modification of SR. In the case of Lorentz invariance violation (LIV), any modification of the dispersion relation for photons will produce such a delay. In the case of a deformation of special relativity (DSR), it has been argued that such a time delay is a generic consequence of nonlocal effects coming from the curvature of momentum space, that can be studied in the so-called relative locality framework [6], and that have specific realizations in noncommutative spacetimes [7–9]. The generality of these results, however, are in tension with recent experimental results putting strong bounds on the scale of the modification of SR [5].

In the present paper we make the observation that photon time delays may not be such a generic consequence of a modification of SR. An specific example has recently appeared in the framework of Snyder spacetime [10], but we will state a more general conclusion for a model based on worldlines of free particles that propagate in any noncommutative spacetime. This may seem an arbitrary way to modify SR, but in fact it incorporates the main ingredients that are present either in a LIV or in a DSR theory. These are: a modified dispersion relation, and nontrivial translations in spacetime, which represent the loss or deformation of the Poincaré algebra of SR. A modified dispersion relation can be viewed as the effect of a quantum spacetime in the propagation of free particles, while the noncommutativity can be viewed as a way to incorporate a relativity of locality, which is encoded in the nontrivial spacetime translations. One has to note, however, that relative locality refers to how observers witness interactions that are close to them [6], so that a more complete model should take into account the interactions of the photon emission and detection. This will be explored elsewhere [11]; in the present work we stick to a generalization of the simple model considered previously in the literature.

* jcarmona@unizar.es, cortes@unizar.es, relancio@unizar.es

The structure of the paper is as follows: in Sec. II we will define the model and derive the expression for photon time delays. Then, in Sec. III we will see how previous studies in κ -Minkowski and Snyder spacetimes [8–10] are particular cases of this model and give specific conditions for the absence of energy-dependent photon time delays. Finally, we will conclude in Sec. IV.

II. A GENERAL MODEL FOR PHOTON TIME DELAYS IN NONCOMMUTATIVE SPACETIMES

The study of time delay effects in the propagation of particles in a modification of SR needs the specification of a spacetime. A deviation from SR in a commutative spacetime is defined by a modification of the energy-momentum relation, which implies a violation of Lorentz invariance. In contrast, DSR theories are defined in a noncommutative spacetime. While this ingredient is not yet worked out in full generality,¹ there are specific examples that have been explored and considered as benchmarks for the spacetime structure of a relativistic theory beyond SR. These include κ -Minkowski spacetime and the associated momentum space of the κ -Poincaré algebra, and also Snyder spacetime (both examples are reviewed in [13], and they were considered in relation with the calculation of photon time delays in Refs. [8, 9] and [10], respectively). In these cases, not only spacetime, but the whole phase space structure is modified with respect to the canonical phase space of SR.

If (x, p) are the spacetime and momentum coordinates of a canonical phase space,

$$\{p_\mu, x^\nu\} = \delta_\mu^\nu, \quad \{x^\mu, x^\nu\} = \{p_\mu, p_\nu\} = 0, \quad (1)$$

one can construct a nontrivial spacetime $(\tilde{x})$ by considering a linear combination of the x coordinates with coefficients depending on the momentum variables p and a new scale M , which must be necessarily introduced from dimensional arguments:

$$\tilde{x}^\mu = x^\nu \varphi_\nu^\mu(p/M). \quad (2)$$

One can refer to this new space as “noncommutative” in the sense that the Poisson bracket of two of these coordinates is not zero for a generic choice of coefficients φ_ν^μ . If we calculate the Poisson bracket of two spacetime coordinates we find

$$\{\tilde{x}^\mu, \tilde{x}^\nu\} = -x^\sigma \varphi_\rho^\mu \frac{\partial \varphi_\sigma^\nu}{\partial p_\rho} + x^\rho \varphi_\sigma^\nu \frac{\partial \varphi_\rho^\mu}{\partial p_\sigma}. \quad (3)$$

The worldlines of a particle $x^\mu(\tau)$, with τ an arbitrary parameter that flows along the worldline, can be obtained by applying the variational principle to the action

$$\mathcal{S} = \int d\tau [\dot{x}^\mu p_\mu - N(\tau)(C(p) - m^2)] . \quad (4)$$

This is the usual action of a free particle in SR with the substitution of p^2 by the function $C(p)$ which will define the modified dispersion relation, as one can see by taking the derivative of $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to the Lagrange multiplier $N(\tau)$:

$$-\frac{\delta \mathcal{S}}{\delta N(\tau)} = C(p) - m^2 = 0, \quad (5)$$

where the derivative has been equalled to zero because the action must be stationary. When this condition is applied to the derivative of $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to x^μ one gets that p_μ is constant along the worldline, and from the derivative with respect to p_μ , one gets

$$\dot{x}^\mu = N(\tau) \frac{\partial C}{\partial p_\mu}. \quad (6)$$

The coefficient $N(\tau)$ was introduced in Eq. (4) to make the action invariant under reparametrizations $\tau \rightarrow \tau' = f(\tau)$. Once we get Eq. (6), we can choose $N(\tau)$ to take any particular value; if we choose $N(\tau) = 1$, the slope of the worldline in this parametrization is constant, $\dot{x}^\mu = (\partial C / \partial p_\mu)$.

¹ DSR theories are naturally formulated in momentum space [12].

We can now obtain the worldline in the noncommutative spacetime:

$$\tilde{x}^\mu(\tau) = \dot{\tilde{x}}^\mu \tau + \tilde{x}(0) = \varphi_\nu^\mu(p) \frac{\partial C}{\partial p_\nu} \tau + \tilde{x}(0), \quad (7)$$

where we just used Eq. (2) and took into account that p_μ is constant along the worldline.

We could also have obtained the previous result from the Poisson bracket of the function $C(p)$ defining the dispersion relation, $C(p) = m^2$, with $\tilde{x}^\mu$:²

$$\dot{\tilde{x}}^\mu = \{C, \tilde{x}^\mu\} = \frac{\partial C}{\partial p_\nu} \{p_\nu, \varphi_\rho^\mu(p) x^\rho\} = \varphi_\nu^\mu(p) \frac{\partial C}{\partial p_\nu}. \quad (8)$$

We can then define the velocity vector of the particle

$$\tilde{v}^i = \frac{\dot{\tilde{x}}^i}{\dot{\tilde{x}}^0} = \frac{\varphi_\nu^i(\partial C(p)/\partial p_\nu)}{\varphi_\nu^0(\partial C(p)/\partial p_\nu)}. \quad (9)$$

A. Determination of time delays

Our model considers the worldline of a free particle (a photon) that has its origin at a source (the emission point) and its end at a detector (the detection point). Since there is only one vector (the momentum $\vec{p}$ of the particle), the problem can be treated in $1+1$ dimensions without any loss of generality, so we will speak of its energy E and its momentum $p \equiv |\vec{p}|$.³ We assume that low-energy photons (in the limit $p/M \rightarrow 0$) behave as in SR: that is, their time of travel equals (in natural units, $c = 1$) the distance between source and detector. In fact, we will define this distance L from the emission at the source and absorption at the detector of low-energy photons, for which the functions $\varphi_\nu^\mu \rightarrow \delta_\nu^\mu$, so that they observe a commutative spacetime ($\tilde{x}^\mu \rightarrow x^\mu$).

The time delay of a high-energy photon of momentum p at the detector with respect to a low-energy photon emitted “simultaneously at the same point” has two different sources: the modified dispersion relation $C(p) = 0$, which defines the slope of the worldline, and the definition of simultaneity and spatial locality, which in a noncommutative spacetime, defined by the functions $\varphi(E, p)$ of Eq. (2), are relative concepts for observers whose spacetime origin do not coincide. In this case, there are two observers that must be brought into play: observer A , which is at the source, and observer B , which is at the detector. We define the origin of observer A as the time and location of both a high and a low energy photon (this is the definition of a simultaneous emission at the source) and define the spacetime origin of observer B to coincide with the detection of the low-energy photon.

One can obtain the translation relating the noncommutative spacetime coordinates of both observers from the trivial translations relating the commutative coordinates, $x^B = x^A - L$, $t^B = t^A - L$ and Eq. (2):

$$\tilde{t}^B = \varphi_0^0 t^B + \varphi_1^0 x^B = \tilde{t}^A - L(\varphi_0^0 + \varphi_1^0) \quad (10)$$

$$\tilde{x}^B = \varphi_0^1 t^B + \varphi_1^1 x^B = \tilde{x}^A - L(\varphi_0^1 + \varphi_1^1). \quad (11)$$

The worldline of the high energy particle for observer A is

$$\tilde{x}^A = \tilde{v} \tilde{t}^A, \quad (12)$$

since $\tilde{x}^A = 0, \tilde{t}^A = 0$ corresponds to the initial point of the worldline, and $\tilde{v}$ is obtained particularizing Eq. (9) to $1+1$ dimensions:

$$\tilde{v} = \frac{\varphi_0^1(\partial C/\partial E) - \varphi_1^1(\partial C/\partial p)}{\varphi_0^0(\partial C/\partial E) - \varphi_1^0(\partial C/\partial p)}, \quad (13)$$

where the minus signs appear due to the fact that $p_1 = -p^1 = -p$, and so $\partial C/\partial p_1 = -\partial C/\partial p$. We can now obtain the worldline for observer B by applying the translations Eqs. (11) and (10) to Eq. (12):

$$\tilde{x}^B = \tilde{x}^A - L(\varphi_0^1 + \varphi_1^1) = \tilde{v} [\tilde{t}^B + L(\varphi_0^0 + \varphi_1^0)] - L(\varphi_0^1 + \varphi_1^1). \quad (14)$$

² This amounts to consider $C(p)$ as the generator of the evolution in τ , which is the natural interpretation of Eq. (4), in which $C(p)$ appears multiplying the coefficient $N(\tau)$ which implements the invariance of the action under reparameterizations.

³ Although we use the same notation (p) for the four-momentum in $3+1$ and for the momentum in $1+1$, one can easily identify from the context which one is involved in the different equations.

The end of the worldline for observer B happens at $\tilde{x}^B = 0$.⁴ We can then obtain the value of $\tilde{t}^B$ at that point from Eq. (14); this will give us the time-delay $\tilde{T} \equiv \tilde{t}^B(\tilde{x}^B = 0)$ with respect to the arrival of the low-energy photon (that took place at $\tilde{t}^B = 0$):

$$\tilde{T} = \tilde{v}^{-1} L(\varphi_0^1 + \varphi_1^1) - L(\varphi_0^0 + \varphi_1^0) = L \left[(\varphi_0^1 + \varphi_1^1) \frac{\varphi_0^0(\partial C/\partial E) - \varphi_1^0(\partial C/\partial p)}{\varphi_0^1(\partial C/\partial E) - \varphi_1^1(\partial C/\partial p)} - (\varphi_0^0 + \varphi_1^0) \right]. \quad (15)$$

Note that this equation is in fact valid for the time delay of any high-energy particle, independently of whether it is a photon or not. In the case of a particle of nonzero mass, Eq. (15) includes both the usual special relativistic time-delay of a massive particle and the time-delay induced by new physics with respect the arrival of a low-energy photon emitted simultaneously at the source.

B. Momenta as generators of translations in spacetime

The functions φ_ν^μ that were introduced in Eq. (2) are in correspondence with the Poisson brackets of energy and momentum with the noncommutative spacetime coordinates:

$$\{E, \tilde{t}\} = \{E, \varphi_\nu^0 x^\nu\} = \varphi_0^0 \quad \{E, \tilde{x}\} = \varphi_0^1 \quad \{p, \tilde{t}\} = -\varphi_1^0 \quad \{p, \tilde{x}\} = -\varphi_1^1. \quad (16)$$

where again the minus signs appear due to $p_1 = -p^1 = -p$.

The transformations Eqs. (10) and (11) between observers A and B can then be written in the form

$$\tilde{t}^B = \tilde{t}^A - L\{E, \tilde{t}\} + L\{p, \tilde{t}\} \quad (17)$$

$$\tilde{x}^B = \tilde{x}^A - L\{E, \tilde{x}\} + L\{p, \tilde{x}\}. \quad (18)$$

These transformations correspond, then, to translations in the noncommutative spacetime which are generated by the energy and the momentum, even if the $(\tilde{x}^\mu, p_\nu)$ phase space is noncanonical. This was in fact the approach taken in the analyses of Refs. [8, 9] and [10].

The formula for the time-delay Eq. (15) can then be written in terms of Poisson brackets in the following form:

$$\tilde{T} = (L\{E, \tilde{x}\} - L\{p, \tilde{x}\}) \cdot \left(\frac{(\partial C/\partial E)\{E, \tilde{t}\} + (\partial C/\partial p)\{p, \tilde{t}\}}{(\partial C/\partial E)\{E, \tilde{x}\} + (\partial C/\partial p)\{p, \tilde{x}\}} \right) - L\{E, \tilde{t}\} + L\{p, \tilde{t}\}. \quad (19)$$

In a commutative spacetime, we have $\{E, t\} = 1$, $\{E, x\} = 0$, $\{p, t\} = 0$, $\{p, x\} = -1$, and then Eq. (19) gives

$$T = -L \left(1 + \frac{\partial C/\partial E}{\partial C/\partial p} \right). \quad (20)$$

This expression contains of course the particular case of SR, $T = -L(1 - E/p)$, which is zero for photons.

III. DISCUSSION

A. A particular example: photon time delays in κ -Minkowski spacetime

κ -Minkowski spacetime has been considered as a model of a quantum spacetime that could emerge in a quantum theory of gravity [4]. It is defined by the following commutation relations for the spatial ($\tilde{x}^i$) and time ($\tilde{x}^0 \equiv \tilde{t}$) coordinates:

$$[\tilde{x}^i, \tilde{x}^0] = \frac{i}{\kappa} \tilde{x}^i, \quad [\tilde{x}^i, \tilde{x}^j] = 0. \quad (21)$$

With the identification of $\kappa \equiv M$, this corresponds to the Poisson bracket in $(1+1)$ -dimensional spacetime

$$\{\tilde{x}, \tilde{t}\} = M^{-1} \tilde{x}. \quad (22)$$

⁴ We are assuming that the detector is at rest. Then the space location for the detection of the high energy particle and the low energy photon coincide.

It is well known that κ -Minkowski is the noncommutative spacetime that is underneath the deformation of the Lorentz algebra known as κ -Poincaré [13]. This fact was used in Ref. [8] to try to answer the question of the momentum dependence of the speed of massless particles in this model of quantum spacetime. To this end, they worked in the, so-called, “bicrossproduct basis” of κ -Poincaré, where the κ -Minkowski deformed Casimir at leading order in κ^{-1} is

$$C(p) = p_0^2 - \vec{p}^2 + \frac{1}{M} p_0 \vec{p}^2 \equiv m^2, \quad (23)$$

and from Ref. [8] we read the Poisson brackets in 1 + 1 dimensions:

$$\{E, \tilde{t}\} = 1 \quad \{E, \tilde{x}\} = 0 \quad \{p, \tilde{t}\} = \frac{p}{M} \quad \{p, \tilde{x}\} = -1, \quad (24)$$

so that Eq. (19) gives

$$\tilde{T}[\text{bicross}] = -L \left(1 + \frac{\partial C / \partial E}{\partial C / \partial p} \right). \quad (25)$$

This is exactly the same result for the time delay that we found in the case of a commutative spacetime, Eq. (20). When one uses the explicit form of the Casimir in the bicrossproduct basis [Eq. (23)] one finds

$$\tilde{T}[\text{bicross}] = -L \left(1 - \frac{E}{p} \right) + \frac{L}{M} \left(\frac{E^2}{p} + \frac{p}{2} \right). \quad (26)$$

For photons, $m = 0$ in Eq. (23), $E = p(1 - p/M)$ at first order, so that the time delay between a high-energy and a low-energy photon emitted simultaneously by the same source is Lp/M . This was the result obtained in Refs. [8, 9], which apparently concluded that propagation in κ -Minkowski spacetime implies an energy-dependent photon time delay.

However, we want to point out that the previous conclusion is not an inevitable consequence of the quantum nature of spacetime modelled by the κ -Minkowski commutation relations, but rather the result of the choice of a particular basis of the κ -Poincaré deformation algebra, which defines the deformed Casimir, that is, the particle dispersion relation. Since the κ -Poincaré algebra is a quantum nonlinear algebra, one can choose different bases related by arbitrary nonlinear transformations of momenta, all of them being algebraically equivalent. As Ref. [13] showed, they may be chosen as energy-momentum sectors of different DSR theories, but all of them share the same noncommutative spacetime structure, which is given by the κ -Minkowski spacetime of Eq. (21).

A particular choice of basis in κ -Poincaré is the so-called “classical basis”, for which the Casimir is the same as the one of special relativity, that is,

$$C(p) = p_0^2 - \vec{p}^2, \quad (27)$$

and the Poisson brackets in 1 + 1 dimensions are, at leading order [13],

$$\{E, \tilde{t}\} = 1 \quad \{E, \tilde{x}\} = -\frac{p}{M} \quad \{p, \tilde{t}\} = 0 \quad \{p, \tilde{x}\} = -\left(1 + \frac{E}{M}\right). \quad (28)$$

Eq. (19) gives in this case

$$\tilde{T}[\text{class}] = -L \left(1 + \frac{\partial C / \partial E}{\partial C / \partial p} \right) \left(1 + \frac{E}{M} \right) = -L \left(1 - \frac{E}{p} \right) \left(1 + \frac{E}{M} \right). \quad (29)$$

Therefore, for massless particles ($E = p$), there is not any time delay in the classical basis, even though the spacetime is not commutative.

Another basis proposed in Ref. [13] is the Magueijo-Smolín basis. The modified Casimir at first order in this basis is

$$C(p) = p_0^2 - \vec{p}^2 + \frac{1}{M} p_0^3 - \frac{1}{M} p_0 \vec{p}^2, \quad (30)$$

and the Poisson brackets in 1 + 1 dimensions are, at leading order,

$$\{E, \tilde{t}\} = \left(1 - \frac{2E}{M} \right) \quad \{E, \tilde{x}\} = -\frac{p}{M} \quad \{p, \tilde{t}\} = \frac{p}{M} \quad \{p, \tilde{x}\} = -1. \quad (31)$$

Eq. (19) gives in this case

$$\tilde{T}[\text{M-S}] = -L \left(1 + \frac{\partial C/\partial E}{\partial C/\partial p} \right) \left[1 - \frac{p}{M} \frac{\partial C/\partial E}{\partial C/\partial p} - 2 \frac{E}{M} \right]. \quad (32)$$

From the expression of the Casimir [Eq. (30)] one has

$$\frac{\partial C/\partial E}{\partial C/\partial p} = -\frac{E}{p} + \left(1 - \frac{E}{p} \right) \frac{E+p}{2M} \quad (33)$$

and then

$$\tilde{T}[\text{M-S}] = -L \left(1 - \frac{E}{p} \right) \left[1 - \frac{E-p}{2M} \right]. \quad (34)$$

As in the classical basis, we see that for massless particles ($E = p$) there is not any time delay.

B. Another example of noncommutativity: Snyder spacetime

The first attempt to go beyond the continuum classical spacetime of SR maintaining Lorentz invariance was carried out by Snyder [14]. He proposed a noncommutative spacetime

$$[\tilde{x}_\mu, \tilde{x}_\nu] = \frac{i}{M^2} J_{\mu\nu}, \quad (35)$$

with $J_{\mu\nu}$ the generators of the Lorentz algebra.

As in the case of κ -Minkowski, there are different realizations in phase space. In the representation originally proposed by Snyder, the Poisson brackets in $1+1$ dimensions are

$$\{E, \tilde{t}\} = \left(1 + \frac{E^2}{M^2} \right) \quad \{E, \tilde{x}\} = \frac{Ep}{M^2} \quad \{p, \tilde{t}\} = \frac{Ep}{M^2} \quad \{p, \tilde{x}\} = -\left(1 - \frac{p^2}{M^2} \right), \quad (36)$$

and then

$$\tilde{T}[\text{Snyder}] = -L \left(1 + \frac{\partial C/\partial E}{\partial C/\partial p} \right), \quad (37)$$

while in the representation of Maggiore [15]

$$\{E, \tilde{t}\} = \sqrt{1 + (E^2 - p^2)/M^2} \quad \{E, \tilde{x}\} = 0 \quad \{p, \tilde{t}\} = 0 \quad \{p, \tilde{x}\} = -\sqrt{1 + (E^2 - p^2)/M^2} \quad (38)$$

and

$$\tilde{T}[\text{Maggiore}] = -L \left(1 + \frac{\partial C/\partial E}{\partial C/\partial p} \right) \sqrt{1 + (E^2 - p^2)/M^2}. \quad (39)$$

In both representations $C(p)$ is a function of E , p only through the combination $(E^2 - p^2)$. Then, for photons ($C(p) = 0$), one has $E = p$ and

$$\left(1 + \frac{\partial C/\partial E}{\partial C/\partial p} \right) \Big|_{C=0} = \left(1 - \frac{E}{p} \right) \Big|_{E=p} = 0 \quad (40)$$

There is then no time delay for photons in Snyder spacetime, a result obtained recently [10] by identifying the coordinates in a curved momentum space of constant curvature that gives a geometric implementation of Snyder spacetime. We have shown that the result is contained as a particular case of the general expression (19) for the time delay in a model with a noncommutative spacetime.

C. Condition for the absence of a photon time delay

Having examined the most prominent examples in the literature, let us see now what happens when one considers generic modified dispersion relations and Poisson brackets at first order. The most general isotropic form⁵ for the functions φ_ν^μ at first order is

$$\varphi_0^0 = 1 + \frac{\delta_1}{M} p_0 \quad \varphi_i^0 = \frac{\delta_2}{M} p_i \quad \varphi_0^i = \frac{\delta_3}{M} p^i \quad \varphi_j^i = \delta_j^i \left(1 + \frac{\delta_4}{M} p_0 \right) + \frac{\delta_5}{M} \epsilon_{jk}^i p^k \quad (41)$$

so that the Poisson brackets in 1+1 dimensions are

$$\{E, \tilde{t}\} = 1 + \frac{\delta_1}{M} E \quad \{E, \tilde{x}\} = \frac{\delta_3}{M} p \quad \{p, \tilde{t}\} = \frac{\delta_2}{M} p \quad \{p, \tilde{x}\} = - \left(1 + \frac{\delta_4}{M} E \right). \quad (42)$$

Using the most general modified rotational invariant dispersion relation

$$C(p) = p_0^2 - \vec{p}^2 + \frac{\alpha_1}{M} p_0^3 + \frac{\alpha_2}{M} p_0 \vec{p}^2 = m^2, \quad (43)$$

and substituting in Eq. (19), one finds

$$\tilde{T} = -L \left(1 - \frac{E}{p} \right) + \frac{L}{M} \left[\left(\frac{3}{2} \alpha_1 + \delta_1 - \delta_3 + \alpha_2 \right) \frac{E^2}{p} + \frac{1}{2} \alpha_2 p - (\delta_1 - \delta_3) E \right], \quad (44)$$

and for the massless case one obtains

$$\tilde{T} = L (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \frac{E}{M}. \quad (45)$$

One can check that the same result is obtained just substituting the value of the coefficients for the different bases studied previously. Equations (44) and (45) are valid either with or without an implementation of a relativity principle.

One sees that the photon time delay is independent of the values of the Poisson brackets, and it is zero when

$$\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 0, \quad (46)$$

independently of the spacetime under consideration.

We can do the same computation in the case in which the dominant correction starts at second order (proportional to $1/M^2$):

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_0^0 &= 1 + \frac{\delta_6}{M^2} p_0^2 + \frac{\delta_7}{M^2} \vec{p}^2 & \varphi_i^0 &= \frac{\delta_8}{M^2} p_0 p_i & \varphi_0^i &= \frac{\delta_9}{M^2} p_0 p^i \\ \varphi_j^i &= \delta_j^i \left(1 + \frac{\delta_{10}}{M^2} p_0^2 + \frac{\delta_{11}}{M^2} \vec{p}^2 \right) + \frac{\delta_{12}}{M^2} p^i p_j + \frac{\delta_{13}}{M^2} p_0 \epsilon_{jk}^i p^k \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

In this case the Poisson brackets in 1 + 1 dimensions are

$$\begin{aligned} \{E, \tilde{t}\} &= 1 + \frac{\delta_6}{M^2} E^2 + \frac{\delta_7}{M^2} p^2 & \{E, \tilde{x}\} &= \frac{\delta_9}{M^2} E p \\ \{p, \tilde{t}\} &= -\frac{\delta_8}{M^2} E p & \{p, \tilde{x}\} &= - \left(1 + \frac{\delta_{10}}{M^2} E^2 + \frac{\delta_{11} + \delta_{12}}{M^2} p^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

and using the modified dispersion relation at second order,

$$C(p) = p_0^2 - \vec{p}^2 + \frac{\alpha_3}{M^2} p_0^4 + \frac{\alpha_4}{M^2} p_0^2 \vec{p}^2 = m^2 \quad (49)$$

and substituting in Eq. (19), one finds

$$\tilde{T} = -L \left(1 - \frac{E}{p} \right) + \frac{L}{M} \left[(2\alpha_3 + \alpha_4 + \delta_6 - \delta_9) \frac{E^3}{p} - (\delta_6 - \delta_9) E^2 - \delta_7 p^2 + (\alpha_4 + \delta_7) E p \right]. \quad (50)$$

For the massless case one obtains

$$\tilde{T} = L \frac{3}{2} (\alpha_3 + \alpha_4) \frac{E^2}{M^2}. \quad (51)$$

Once again, the value of the photon time delay is independent of the considered spacetime, and it is zero if

$$\alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = 0. \quad (52)$$

⁵ Isotropy allows to reduce trivially the model in 3 + 1 dimensions to a model in 1 + 1 dimensions.

D. Interpretation of the results for time delays

In all cases considered previously we have found that the time delay is proportional to

$$L [(1 + (\partial C/\partial E)/(\partial C/\partial p))], \quad (53)$$

i.e., to $(L/v - L)$, where v is the velocity of propagation of the high energy particle in the commutative spacetime,

$$v = -\frac{\partial C/\partial p}{\partial C/\partial E}. \quad (54)$$

Then we see that the time delay is just the naive result taking into account the (possible) energy dependence of the velocity of propagation, multiplied by a factor which will involve the dependence on the details of the noncommutative spacetime. This result can be easily understood from the general expression (19) for the time delay in any noncommutative spacetime. If one makes $(\partial C/\partial E) + (\partial C/\partial p) = 0$ in Eq. (19), then one sees that the time delay is zero independently of the value of the Poisson brackets.

In the case of photons (for which there is no time delay in SR), and in an expansion in powers of $(1/M)$, the time delay will be proportional to $(1/M)$ [or $(1/M^2)$ if corrections start at second order]. But the factor given by expression (53) is already of order $(1/M)$ [or $(1/M^2)$ for a second order correction]. Then the dominant contribution to the time delay will be independent of the details of the noncommutative spacetime and will be determined just by the modification of the dispersion relation $C(p)$. This is the reason why the coefficients δ_i which parametrize the general form of the dominant term in an expansion for the modification of the Heisenberg algebra cancel in the final expression for the dominant contribution to photon time delays.

Another consequence of the identification of the factor $(L/v - L)$ in the result for the time delay is that the condition for the absence of time delays is $v = 1$. But, taking differentials in the photon dispersion relation, $C(E, p) = 0$, one gets

$$-\frac{\partial C/\partial p}{\partial C/\partial E} \Big|_{C(E,p)=0} = \frac{dE(p)}{dp}, \quad (55)$$

where $E(p)$ is the solution of $C(E, p) = 0$. Then the absence of time delay requires that for photons, $E(p) = p$. If one considers an expansion in powers of $(1/M)$

$$C(E, p) = E^2 - p^2 + \sum_n \frac{1}{M^n} C^{(n)}(E, p), \quad (56)$$

then the conditions that the dispersion relation has to satisfy so that photons do not show a time delay are

$$C^{(n)}(E, p) \Big|_{p=E} = 0. \quad (57)$$

One has $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 0$ for $n = 1$, $\alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = 0$ for $n = 2$ and similar expressions for higher order terms. This is consistent with the result obtained by a general calculation of time delays for a first (or a second) order correction to SR.

In the case of a massive high energy particle one would have a time delay in SR due to the energy dependence of the velocity of propagation of a massive particle that could be modified due to corrections to SR. Even if one considers a modification of SR with no time delay for photons, one will have a time delay for massive particles which will be the mass dependent time delay of SR, multiplied by a factor depending on the details of the noncommutativity proportional to the ratio E/M [or (E^2/M^2)]. In order to have an observation sensitive to the noncommutativity one would require a measurement of the mass dependent time delay with a precision of order (E/M) [or (E^2/M^2)].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The main result obtained in this work is that it is possible to go beyond SR without observable time delays. We have identified that this is the case whenever the velocity of propagation of photons in the commutative spacetime is independent of the energy. Considering a model based on worldlines of particles in a noncommutative spacetime we have found several examples with no time delay for photons: κ -Minkowski in the classical basis, κ -Minkowski in the Magueijo-Smolín basis and Snyder spacetime in two different representations.

The difference between a scenario with LIV and a relativistic theory is that in the latter case one has to keep a (deformed) Poincaré symmetry, which requires a consistency of the modified dispersion relation and the nontrivial

implementation of translational symmetry which fixes the noncommutativity of spacetime. On the contrary, in the case of LIV one can choose independently the dispersion relation and the noncommutativity of spacetime. The absence of time delays is a property which depends exclusively on the dispersion relation and then applies indistinctly to both cases.⁶

All the results of this work are based on a nontrivial implementation of translations through a noncommutative spacetime as the appropriate model to calculate time delays induced by departures from SR. This is the most common framework that has been considered in previous analyses. An alternative (more natural) way to implement nontrivially translations is through a nonlocality in the interaction of particles. In this case one should consider the nonlocality of the interactions responsible for the emission and detection of particles as the appropriate model to study the possibility to have observable time delays in such a framework. In a future work [11] we will study time delays in this alternative framework to confirm the conclusions obtained in the present paper.

One could take the main conclusion of this work as bad news from a phenomenological point of view since it means that one of the most promising ways to try to find signals of departures from SR does not always apply. If the possible departures from SR induced by quantum gravity are such that there is no time delay for photons then one of the windows to quantum gravity phenomenology gets closed. Alternatively one can take the result as good news since it means that the strong constraints on the mass scale parametrizing the departures from SR obtained from the absence of observations of time delays for photons are not applicable with full generality. This opens up the interesting possibility that such scale be much smaller than its simplest estimate (the Planck mass) without any phenomenological inconsistency.⁷ The simplest estimate is based on naturalness but we already know that this argument fails in the case of the vacuum energy, and we have also hints that it also fails in the estimate for the mass of elementary scalars (the standard model (SM) Higgs particle seems to be much lighter than the scale limiting the domain of validity of the SM). Then it seems reasonable to explore the possibility of some mechanism generating a scale for the departures from SR much smaller than this simplest estimate. If this were the case then one would have to reconsider searches of possible signals of quantum gravity that may have been discarded based on the assumption that the scale for such signals is of the order of the Planck mass.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the Spanish MINECO FPA2015-65745-P (MINECO/FEDER) and Spanish DGIID-DGA Grant No. 2015-E24/2. We acknowledge useful conversations with Niccolò Loreti.

-
- [1] V. A. Kostelecky and N. Russell, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 11 (2011), arXiv:0801.0287 [hep-ph]; J. C. Long and V. A. Kostelecky, Phys. Rev. **D91**, 092003 (2015), arXiv:1412.8362 [hep-ex]; A. Kostelecky, E. Lunghi, and A. R. Vieira, (2016), arXiv:1610.08755 [hep-ph]; V. A. Kostelecky, A. C. Melissinos, and M. Mewes, Phys. Lett. **B761**, 1 (2016), arXiv:1608.02592 [gr-qc].
 - [2] J. Ehlers and C. Lammerzahl, eds., *Special Relativity: Will It Survive the Next 100 Years?*, Vol. 702 (Lect. Notes Phys., Springer, 2006).
 - [3] R. Kallosh, A. D. Linde, D. A. Linde, and L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 912 (1995), arXiv:hep-th/9502069 [hep-th].
 - [4] G. Amelino-Camelia, Living Rev. Rel. **16**, 5 (2013), arXiv:0806.0339 [gr-qc].
 - [5] A. A. Abdo *et al.* (Fermi GBM/LAT), Nature **462**, 331 (2009), arXiv:0908.1832 [astro-ph.HE]; A. Abramowski *et al.* (HESS), Astropart. Phys. **34**, 738 (2011), arXiv:1101.3650 [astro-ph.HE]; R. J. Nemiroff, R. Connolly, J. Holmes, and A. B. Kostinski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 231103 (2012), arXiv:1109.5191 [astro-ph.CO]; V. Vasileiou, A. Jacholkowska, F. Piron, J. Bolmont, C. Couturier, J. Granot, F. W. Stecker, J. Cohen-Tanugi, and F. Longo, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 122001 (2013), arXiv:1305.3463 [astro-ph.HE]; V. Vasileiou, J. Granot, T. Piran, and G. Amelino-Camelia, Nature Phys. **11**, 344 (2015).
 - [6] G. Amelino-Camelia, L. Freidel, J. Kowalski-Glikman, and L. Smolin, Phys. Rev. **D84**, 084010 (2011), arXiv:1101.0931 [hep-th].
 - [7] G. Gubitosi and F. Mercati, Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 145002 (2013), arXiv:1106.5710 [gr-qc].
 - [8] G. Amelino-Camelia, N. Loreti, and G. Rosati, Phys. Lett. **B700**, 150 (2011), arXiv:1102.4637 [hep-th].
 - [9] N. Loreti, Phys. Rev. **D90**, 124013 (2014), arXiv:1404.5093 [hep-th].
 - [10] S. Mignemi and A. Samsarov, (2016), arXiv:1610.09692 [hep-th].

⁶ Note that it is possible to have LIV without modifying the dispersion relation, so that also in this case one can have scenarios which do not contain a photon time delay.

⁷ All the constraints based on the use of effective field theory to go beyond SR [1] apply only to an scenario without the presence of a relativity principle.

- [11] J. M. Carmona, J. L. Cortés, and J. J. Relancio, in preparation.
- [12] G. Amelino-Camelia, Int.J.Mod.Phys. **D11**, 1643 (2002), arXiv:gr-qc/0210063 [gr-qc]; J. Magueijo and L. Smolin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 190403 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0112090 [hep-th]; G. Amelino-Camelia, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D12**, 1211 (2003), arXiv:astro-ph/0209232 [astro-ph].
- [13] J. Kowalski-Glikman and S. Nowak, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **D12**, 299 (2003), arXiv:hep-th/0204245 [hep-th].
- [14] H. S. Snyder, Phys. Rev. **71**, 38 (1947).
- [15] M. Maggiore, Phys. Lett. **B319**, 83 (1993), arXiv:hep-th/9309034 [hep-th].